

To: Davis, Tim[TimDavis@mt.gov]
Cc: Ayn Schmit[Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov]
From: Miller, Johanna
Sent: Wed 5/10/2017 10:19:12 PM
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Tim – Following up on your question about the budget for the FY 17 PPGs. As we thought, the 10% reduction was the conservative estimate given prior to a budget being passed. While we still don't have our approved operating plan that allocates funds to the specific programs, we are expecting the water program funding levels to remain flat at FY 16 levels or see a slight reduction to accommodate the mandated approx. 1.5% rescission of funds (ie sending \$ back to the treasury).

I've been told to expect the operating plan to be complete by late next week and, by the end of May, for the Region to have a better idea of PPG funding amounts. The plan is to award grants by late June/early July.

Hope this is helpful. Take care. Johanna

From: Davis, Tim [mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:51 PM
To: Schmit, Ayn <Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Ayn –

Yes, thanks for remember Whitefish. If we can just talk quickly about the individual variance for Whitefish, too, that would be great since it is the first individual nutrient variance application we have reviewed.

Thanks again,

Tim

From: Schmit, Ayn [<mailto:Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:49 PM
To: Davis, Tim; Miller, Johanna
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Yes, thanks- it does. I recall that you had also wanted to talk about a pending individual variance for Whitefish?

From: Davis, Tim [<mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:44 PM
To: Schmit, Ayn <Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Ayn –

Hi. Yes, what you propose will be useful. I am hoping that we can also discuss your goal and philosophy as management behind the comments and I can share with you what we are hoping to get out of the comments in order to inform our final decision. I am fine if Tina is on the call, but I would like to keep the conversation at that higher level then we can go into the details and weeds next week when we have other staff on the call. Does that work for you?

Thanks,

Tim

From: Schmit, Ayn [<mailto:Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:32 PM
To: Davis, Tim; Miller, Johanna
Subject: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Tim, I wanted to run by you what we were thinking for our call with you tomorrow. I had planned on giving you a sense of the current volume of comments in our draft letter as it sits now, and briefly outlining the major comment areas- but only if that is helpful. What would you

like to get from our conversation tomorrow?

Also, how would you feel about having Tina in the conversation? I was thinking of including her in case we want to jump into any of the weeds. But if you'd prefer a management-level conversation, that is fine, too. Let me know your thoughts on that.

Thanks for taking the time to talk with us at what I know is a really difficult time for you.

Ayn E. Schmit / Acting Director, Clean Water Program / EPA Region 8 / 303-312-6220 /
1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, CO 80202

Protect our Nation's Waters <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/epa-region-8-mountains-and-plains>